

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

STEVEN LAMAR WOODS, §  
Plaintiff, §  
§  
v. § No. 3:21-cv-03028-B (BT)  
§  
BEDFORD POLICE DEPARTMENT, §  
et al., §  
Defendants. §

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

This is a civil rights action brought by *pro se* Plaintiff Steven Lamar Woods, who is proceeding *in forma pauperis*. Woods filed his complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on December 6, 2021, but he did not file his civil rights pleadings on the proper form. On December 8, the Court sent Woods a Notice of Deficiency and Order (ECF No. 6), which instructed him to submit his civil rights claims on the court-approved form. The Order informed Woods that failure to respond and cure the deficiency by January 7, 2022 could result in a recommendation that his case be dismissed. Woods failed to comply with the Court's order. Therefore, this case should be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

Rule 41(b) allows a court to dismiss an action *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or for failure to comply with the federal rules or any court order. *Griggs v. S.G.E. Mgmt., L.L.C.*, 905 F.3d 835, 844 (5th Cir. 2018) (citing *McCullough v. Lynaugh*, 835 F.2d 1126, 1127 (5th Cir. 1988) (per curiam)); *accord Nottingham v.*

*Warden, Bill Clements Unit*, 837 F.3d 438, 440 (5th Cir. 2016) (failure to comply with a court order); *Rosin v. Thaler*, 450 F. App'x 383, 383-84 (5th Cir. 2011) (per curiam) (failure to prosecute). “This authority [under Rule 41(b)] flows from the court’s inherent power to control its docket and prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases.” *Boudwin v. Graystone Ins. Co., Ltd.*, 756 F.2d 399, 401 (5th Cir. 1985) (citing *Link v. Wabash, R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626 (1962)). Here, Woods has failed to comply with the Court’s order to submit his civil rights pleadings on the court-approved form. The information required by the court-approved form is necessary for the Court to perform its judicial screening function. This litigation cannot proceed until Woods cures this deficiency. Woods has failed to prosecute his lawsuit and also failed to obey a court order. Dismissal without prejudice is warranted under these circumstances.

The Court should dismiss Woods’s complaint without prejudice under Rule 41(b).

SO RECOMMENDED.

Signed January 10, 2022.



---

REBECCA RUTHERFORD  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND  
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

A copy of this report and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of this report and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b).* In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's report and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Services Automobile Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).